

Applicant : Heinrich Schenk et al.
Serial No. : 09/914,635
Filed : August 29, 2001
Page : 7 of 10

Attorney's Docket No.: 12816-040001 / S 1463 GC/rfu

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached replacement sheet 2 of the drawings replaces amended sheet 2 of the drawings.

REMARKS

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

In an interview on February 1, 2005, Applicant drew attention to certain comments in the remarks that suggested that the incorrect set of claims had been examined. The Examiner observed that certain amended sheets that were filed with the application apparently had been omitted during the initial processing of this application.

Applicant agreed to provide the amended sheets, which include replacement claims, in a response to the office action.

REPLACEMENT SHEETS FROM RULE 66 PCT AMENDMENT

Applicant encloses herewith amended sheets filed under Rule 66 PCT. These sheets include replacement pages 2, 2a, 9, 10, 11, 12, and sheet 2 of the drawings.

The amended sheets include claims that render the objections to the claims and the drawings moot.

In particular,

- claim 4 as amended under Rule 66 PCT now uses reference numeral (17, 18) to refer to the multiplier circuit; and
- claim 4 no longer recites a multiplicity of subtractor circuits.

Those sheets that do not include claims are incorporated into the enclosed substitute specification. Consistent with Rule 1.125(b), a substitute specification may not include claims.

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Replacement sheet 2 of the drawings has been amended by labeling the second multiplier "18" instead of "15," thereby avoiding the conflict noted by the Examiner in the use of "15" for the serial/parallel converter.

AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS

Claim 1 is amended to delete stray hyphens.

Applicant amends the claims to eliminate multiple dependency. Additional claims are provided to retain the coverage of the original claims but without the need for multiple independent claims.

In particular, multiple-dependent claim 3 has been split into conventional dependent claims 3 and 5. Multiple-dependent claim 4, which would have been improper because it depended on another multiple-dependent claim, has been split into claims 4, 6, 7, and 8.

REJECTIONS UNDER SECTION 102 AND SECTION 103

Applicant declines to address these rejections since they were directed to incorrectly examined claims. Applicant proposes to respond to substantive rejections, if any, in response to a second, non-final office action.

AMENDMENTS TO SPECIFICATION

Pursuant to 37 CFR 1.125, Applicant encloses a substitute specification, together with a marked-up copy as required by 37 CFR 1.125(c). The marked-up copy shows the changes made in the replacement pages filed under Rule 66 PCT and additional amendments made to conform to U.S. practice. No new matter is introduced.

Applicant amends the specification to conform to U.S. practice, as suggested by the Examiner. This amendment includes addition of headings and deletion of language referring specifically to the claims. The foregoing amendments have been incorporated into the enclosed substitute specification.

SUMMARY

Now pending in this application are claims 1-8, which correspond to the claims 1-4 entered under Rule 66 PCT. Of these, claim 1 is independent. These claims, in their original multiple-dependent form, were submitted to the Office at the time of filing and should have been

Applicant : Heinrich Schenk et al.
Serial No. : 09/914,635
Filed : August 29, 2001
Page : 10 of 10

Attorney's Docket No.: 12816-040001 / S 1463 GC/rfu

examined. Accordingly, Applicant requests a second non-final office action examining those claims.

No additional fees are believed to be due in connection with the filing of this response. However, to the extent fees are due, of if a refund is forthcoming, please adjust our deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 8, 2005


Faustino A. Lichauco
Reg. No. 41,942

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906
21020993.doc